

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Currently, claims 2 and 4-12 are pending in this application.

Objections to the Claims:

Claims 8-10 were objected to because of an informality. Section 2 of the Office Action states “For purposes of examination, the Examiner assumes that it is not the voltage set unit that is predetermined but the operating voltages of the game cartridge.” Consistent with the Examiner’s assumption, claim 8 has been amended to require “a voltage set unit” which sets a predetermined first voltage value and a predetermined second voltage value. Applicant notes that the voltage set unit is a component of the claimed recording medium generally, rather than a “game cartridge” specifically. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the claims be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Noguchi (U.S. ‘169) in view of Hagiwara et al (U.S. ‘836, hereinafter “Hagiwara”), and further in view of deMuro (WO ‘863). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection with respect to still pending claims 2, 5 and 6.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Applicant respectfully submits that the three-way combination of Noguchi, Hagiwara and deMuro fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. For example, the combination fails to teach or suggest a recording medium comprising a charge key storage unit storing a charge key unique to the

recording medium, and an authentication unit conducting authentication of a power supply apparatus using the charge key unique to the recording medium.

Page 5 of the Office Action makes reference to page 3, lines 11-27 of deMuro.

This portion of deMuro states the following:

“Upon insertion of the battery 100 into the charger 200, the microprocessor 201 reads the stored information in the memory 101. This stored information preferably contains unique information, such as a bit pattern or value, indicating to the charger 200 that the battery 100 is ‘authentic’ in the sense that it contains the necessary safety circuitry for safe charging of the lithium cell or cells 104. In response to verifying that the memory 101 includes the proper authentication code in storage, the microprocessor 201 commands the memory 101 to toggle the voltage on the port 113 from a first voltage, e.g., a low state, to a second voltage, e.g., a high state, thereby closing the transistor 102 to enable charging of the cells 104. The microprocessor 201 can, for example, instruct the memory 101 to close the transistor 102 by providing a particular signal, such as a predetermined voltage, at terminal 211. This operation provides a bi-directional lockout function that disables charging of the battery 100 in an unauthorized charger and that also disables charging by the charger 200 of an unauthorized battery, such as occurs when a battery does not include a memory when a battery memory does not include the proper authorization code (emphasis added).”

Accordingly, the above-noted passage of deMuro (and other passages of deMuro) fails to teach or suggest a recording medium comprising an authentication unit conducting authentication of a power supply apparatus using a charge key unique to the recording medium. Indeed, the above-noted portion of deMuro describes a microprocessor 201 of charger 200 performing a verification process. Battery 100 does not include an authentication unit conducting authentication of a power supply using a stored charge key unique to the recording medium.

Accordingly, even if the teachings of Noguchi, Hagiwara and deMuro were combined as proposed by the Office Action, the combination would not have taught or

MATSUBARA et al.
Application No. 10/022,412
June 21, 2006


suggested all of the claim limitations. Applicant thus respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Noguchi, Hagiwara and deMuro be withdrawn. Applicant further submits that the combinations of (i) Noguchi, Hagiwara, deMuro and Schneier et al and (ii) Noguchi in view of Green also fail to teach or suggest the above-noted claim limitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of the four-way combination of Noguchi, Hagiwara, deMuro and Schneier, and the rejection of claims 7-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Noguchi and Green be withdrawn.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that this entire application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a notice to this effect. If the Examiner has any questions or believes that an interview would further prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 
Raymond Y. Mah
Reg. No. 41,426

RYM:sl
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4044
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100